B5

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/050,649	01/16/2002	Barry Paul Pershan	Verizon-20	5998

32127 7590 05/04/2004

VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP INC.
C/O CHRISTIAN R. ANDERSEN
600 HIDDEN RIDGE DRIVE
MAILCODE HQEO3H14
IRVING, TX 75038

EXAMINER	
TAYLOR, BARRY W	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2643	6

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/050,649	PERSHAN, BARRY PAUL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Barry W Taylor	2643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 April 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9 and 17-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9 and 17-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) *10-16 and 22-25* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in Paper No. 4 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the claimed inventions are closely related and could be reviewed with a single prior art search. This is not found persuasive because Group I is directed toward an invention that is different and distinct from the invention of Group II and requires detailed search in another area other than the area of Group I.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. This application contains claims (10-16 and 22-25) drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper No. 4. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-6 and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giuhat et al (5,881,145 hereinafter Giuhat) in view of White et al (6,021,126 hereinafter White).

Regarding claims 1 and 17. Giuhat teaches redirection of calls to ported directory numbers wherein the system and method comprises routing the call, using the

ported directory number is used as the Called Party Number, from the originating network node towards the donor network node, intercepting the call at an intermediate network node between originating node and the donor network node, converting the ported directory number to a network address of the recipient network node, routing the call to the recipient network node using the said network address and completing the call to the ported directory number at the recipient network (abstract). In other words, Giuhat allows subscribers to maintain the same directory number when moving from one location and/or service provider to another or changing from one type of service to another, such as from wireless to landline or from business to residential (column 1). Giuhat uses ANI technology to enable routing of a call to a directory number that has been transferred from a donor switching unit at a donor network node in the telephone network to a recipient switching unit at a recipient network node in a different network controlled by a different service provider wherein the telephony network associates the call to the ported directory number in IAM comprising the network address of the recipient network node as the Called Number and the ported directory number as the Original Called Number. Next, at the boundary between the telephony network and different network, the IAM is converted by making the Original Called Party number a Generic Address Parameter and setting a Forwarded Call Indicator flag to indicate that the Called Number as originally dialed has been translated and routing the call into the different network using the converted IAM (col. 2 line 39 – col. 4 line 25). Giuhat shows first switch (see 38 figure 1) pauses when AIN trigger occurs to obtain call processing instructions including second telephone number (see figure 1 wherein first switch 38

queries database 70 wherein second number corresponding to second switch 10 retrieved). Next, the second number is used as the Called Number to forward (i.e. route) the call to second switch (see second switch 10 figure 1). Finally, the second switch response with a TAT trigger due to the fact that the Called Party Number is, in fact, a Location Routing Number, which cannot be dialed therefore queries SCP (see SCP 30 is queried via STP 20 figure 1) for instructions on how to complete the call.

Giuhat does not explicitly show the second switch (see 10 figure) connected to Internet Protocol network.

White also teaches telephone number portability (title and abstract). White describes similar querying messaging being used when the called number is a ported number. In other words, the Called Party Number is replaced with LRN and the actual dialed number is transmitted in a Generic Address Parameter (GAP) field and also sets bit in the forward call indicator parameter thereby notifying other switches that number portability has already been completed for this call. Therefore, the end switch will recognize the message with the LRN in the CPN field as a message relating to a ported number and the switch will utilize the GAP field as the actual destination number. In other words, White discloses the end switch (i.e. second switch) replaces the second number with the first number so that the call may process in a normal manner (see col. 7 line 65 – col. 10 line 5). White further discloses that not all local exchange carriers have AINs, SCPs or ISCPs (col. 10 lines 6-8) therefore employs an Internet Gateway Router (see figure 3 wherein STP 19 connected to Internet Gateway Router 31). White

also uses TCAP queries directed towards SCP via STP, but uses Internet to perform look-up information wherein the Internet Gateway Router formulates a TCAP type message with the LRN placed in the CPN field (col. 11 lines 46-57, col. 12 lines 15-47) and transmits the response back to the querying switch (col. 12 lines 18-20) thereby providing operability over greatly expanded geographic areas (col. 13 lines 38-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the second switch (i.e. 10 figure 1) as taught by Giuhat to use Internet as the database look-up as taught by White for the benefit of expanding services over greatly expanded geographic areas, as well as, providing number portability to local exchange carriers not having advanced intelligent networks (AINs), SCPs, or ISCPs as show in figure 1 of Giuhat.

Regarding claims 2-3. Giuhat does not explicitly show operating the Internet Protocol network to complete the call.

White also teaches telephone number portability (title and abstract). White describes similar querying messaging being used when the called number is a ported number. In other words, the Called Party Number is replaced with LRN and the actual dialed number is transmitted in a Generic Address Parameter (GAP) field and also sets bit in the forward call indicator parameter thereby notifying other switches that number portability has already been completed for this call. Therefore, the end switch will recognize the message with the LRN in the CPN field as a message relating to a ported number and the switch will utilize the GAP field as the actual destination number. In

other words, White discloses the end switch (i.e. second switch) replaces the second number with the first number so that the call may process in a normal manner (see col. 7 line 65 – col. 10 line 5). White further discloses that not all local exchange carriers have AINs, SCPs or ISCPs (col. 10 lines 6-8) therefore employs an Internet Gateway Router (see figure 3 wherein STP 19 connected to Internet Gateway Router 31). White also uses TCAP queries directed towards SCP via STP, but uses Internet to perform look-up information wherein the Internet Gateway Router formulates a TCAP type message with the LRN placed in the CPN field (col. 11 lines 46-57, col. 12 lines 15-47) and transmits the response back to the querying switch (col. 12 lines 18-20) thereby providing operability over greatly expanded geographic areas (col. 13 lines 38-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the second switch (i.e. 10 figure 1) as taught by Giuhat to use Internet as the database look-up as taught by White for the benefit of expanding services over greatly expanded geographic areas, as well as, providing number portability to local exchange carriers not having advanced intelligent networks (AINs), SCPs, or ISCPs as show in figure 1 of Giuhat.

Regarding claims 4 and 18. Giuhat teaches the second number is used as the Called Number to forward (i.e. route) the call to second switch (see second switch 10 figure 1). The second switch response with a TAT trigger due to the fact that the Called Party Number is, in fact, a Location Routing Number, which cannot be dialed therefore

queries SCP (see SCP 30 is queried via STP 20 figure 1) for instructions on how to complete the call.

However, Giuhat does not show routing to the Internet Protocol.

White also teaches telephone number portability (title and abstract). White describes similar querying messaging being used when the called number is a ported number. In other words, the Called Party Number is replaced with LRN and the actual dialed number is transmitted in a Generic Address Parameter (GAP) field and also sets bit in the forward call indicator parameter thereby notifying other switches that number portability has already been completed for this call. Therefore, the end switch will recognize the message with the LRN in the CPN field as a message relating to a ported number and the switch will utilize the GAP field as the actual destination number. In other words, White discloses the end switch (i.e. second switch) replaces the second number with the first number so that the call may process in a normal manner (see col. 7 line 65 – col. 10 line 5). White further discloses that not all local exchange carriers have AINs, SCPs or ISCPs (col. 10 lines 6-8) therefore employs an Internet Gateway Router (see figure 3 wherein STP 19 connected to Internet Gateway Router 31). White also uses TCAP queries directed towards SCP via STP, but uses Internet to perform look-up information wherein the Internet Gateway Router formulates a TCAP type message with the LRN placed in the CPN field (col. 11 lines 46-57, col. 12 lines 15-47) and transmits the response back to the querying switch (col. 12 lines 18-20) thereby providing operability over greatly expanded geographic areas (col. 13 lines 38-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the second switch (i.e. 10 figure 1) as taught by Giuhat to use Internet as the database look-up as taught by White for the benefit of expanding services over greatly expanded geographic areas, as well as, providing number portability to local exchange carriers not having advanced intelligent networks (AINs), SCPs, or ISCPs as show in figure 1 of Giuhat.

Regarding claims 5 and 20. Giuhat shows the first switch (38 figure 1) uses first trigger for LRN information (col. 7 lines 3-15).

Regarding claims 6 and 21. Giuhat further shows the second switch (10 figure 1) is a terminating attempt trigger (col. 7 lines 16-36, col. 8 lines 45-64).

Regarding claim 19. Giuhat teaches using AIN triggers (see 38 figure 1, col. 7 lines 3-15 wherein LRN trigger used and col. 7 lines 16-36, col. 8 lines 45-64 wherein terminating attempt trigger used.

4. Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giuhat et al (5,881,145 hereinafter Giuhat) in view of White et al (6,021,126 hereinafter White) further in view of White et al (6,243,374).

Regarding claims 7-9. Giuhat in view of White do not show AIN services subscribed to by the called party.

However, White et al discloses in a latter patent (i.e. 6,243,374) discloses Centrex (col. 5 line 40) type services such as call forwarding, call blocking, call screening, automatic call distribution and the like (col. 13 lines 31-49, col. 18 lines 50-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Giuhat in view of White to incorporate Centrex type services as taught by White (6,243,374) enabling for AIN type services, such as call forwarding and call screening to be provided to subscribers.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barry W. Taylor whose telephone number is (703) 305-4811. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30am to 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on (703) 305-4708. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Technology Center 2600 customer service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

CURTIS KUNTZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600